REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

As explained in the Response filed on May 25, 2005, European Application Publication No. 0 825 080 to *Ono et al.* discloses an anti-lock braking system in which the braking force of the wheel which is the object of control is controlled on the basis of: (1) the surface μ slope of the wheel and (2) the braking force of the reference wheel. In contrast, the braking force distribution control device recited in Claim 2 comprises, in combination with the other claimed features, control means which controls the braking torque of the wheel which is the object of control on the basis of the road surface μ slope of the wheel which is the object of control and the road surface μ slope of a reference wheel among the road surface μ slopes estimated by the road surface μ slope estimating means.

It is understood from the comments in the Advisory Action that although *Ono et al.* does not disclose controlling the braking torque of the wheel which is the object of control on the basis of the road surface μ slope of the wheel which is the object of control and the road surface μ slope of a reference wheel, the braking force of the reference wheel described in *Ono et al.* can be said to be a function of the μ slope of the reference wheel and so *Ono et al.* can be broadly interpreted as disclosing the claimed control means.

Considering this interpretation, independent Claim 2 has been amended to recite that the control means controls the braking torque of the wheel which is the object of control using the road surface μ slope of the wheel which is the object of control and the road surface μ slope of a reference wheel. In *Ono et al.*, the braking

torque of the wheel which is the object of control is not controlled using the road surface μ slope of the wheel which is the object of control and the road surface μ slope of a reference wheel. It is thus respectfully submitted that the braking force distribution control device recited in independent Claim 2, as well as dependent Claims 3-8, is patentably distinguishable over the disclosure contained in *Ono et al.*.

New Claims 18-30 are presented by way of this Amendment, including independent Claims 18 and 25. Claim 18 is similar to independent Claim 2, except that Claim 18 recites that the control means determines a relationship between the road surface μ slope of the wheel which is the object of control and the road surface μ slope of a reference wheel, and controls the braking torque of the wheel which is the object of control taking into account such relationship.

New independent Claim 25 is somewhat different in that it recites that the control means controls the braking torque of the wheel which is the object of control by taking into account the difference between the road surface μ slope of the wheel which is the object of control and the road surface μ slope of the reference wheel.

Ono et al. does not disclose a braking force distribution control device utilizing such a control means, together with the other claimed features set forth in independent Claims 18 and 25. It is thus respectfully submitted that independent Claims 18 and 25, as well as dependent Claims 19-24 and 26-30, are patentably distinguishable over the disclosure contained in *Ono et al.*

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful

in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 27, 2005

By: _____
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32,814

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620